

The Assessment and Enhancement of Performance Management Within the South African Local Government Environment

MM Selepe

University of Limpopo, South Africa

Abstract: This paper deals with the performance of the Municipal Managers and Managers accountable to them as well as institutional performance of a municipality. It outlines performance appraisals, performance management. The paper examines general performance problems as well as possible remedies. The South African Local Government performance management system consists of the individual and institutional performance management. The paper will focus on Section 57 managers which deal with the appointment of Municipal managers and managers accountable to the Municipal Manager as well as their performance agreements. The paper explains the municipal performance management. In terms of the institutional performance, measuring tools of the municipality which are the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and the Service Delivery Implementation plan (SDIP) will be explained. This paper seeks to provide guidelines to councillors, managers, officials and local government stakeholders in developing and implementing a performance management system in terms of the requirements of the legislation. The paper strives to establish common language and thereby ensuring some level of consistency and uniformity in the application of concepts.

Keywords: Performance appraisal, Performance management, Municipal manager, Municipality

1. Introduction

The initial emphasis after the transition to democracy in South Africa was on Policy development. This was later overtaken by a concern to promote efficient, economical and effective implementation of the developed policies. As the local sphere of government was developed there came about an increased emphasis on monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of these policies and more specifically a concern with performance management. Good performance management helps identify what policies and processes work and why they work. Thus, the collection and management of information with regard to performance is critical to effective operational planning and monitoring and evaluation required to enhance accountability. With an appropriate performance management system, information that assists stakeholders to exert pressure for improvements in the service delivery processes is generated. Central to the performance management system is the development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) as instruments to assess performance. The indicators help to translate complex socio-economic development challenges into quantifiable and measurable outputs. They are therefore crucial if a proper assessment is to be done on the impact of municipalities in improving the quality of life of all (Venter *et al.*, 2007:110).

Craythorne (2006:120) states that performance management is most commonly thought of as a technique applied to the performance of staff. While that is true, performance management is a powerful tool that can be applied to the performance of an organisation and thereby indirectly to the political figures who are responsible for that organisation. It must give intelligence as to whether the outcomes, inputs and outputs have been achieved and whether a more effective, efficient and economic system is evolving. This intelligence is used in the review phase to inform the improvement phase. The management of human resources is as important as the management of the organisational system. People management must include the concepts of changing an existing culture and introducing the concept of skills- and leadership development. It is this human intervention element of change management that must receive the needed attention if the performance management journey is to succeed.

Performance management is a new requirement for local government in South Africa. Moreover it is a specialised field with concepts usually interpreted and applied differently. Municipalities deliver services critical to the well-being and development of the local government sphere. In order to ensure that municipal service delivery is as effective,

efficient and economical as possible, municipalities are required to formulate strategic plans, allocating resources through a municipal budgeting process; and monitor and report on the results as required by applicable legislation. Performance information used in performance management is essential to focus attention of stakeholders on performance of individual municipalities against their Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and Service Delivery Budget Implementation Plans (SDBIPs). In the municipal context, a comprehensive and elaborate system of monitoring performance of municipalities has been legislated. The system is intended to continuously monitor performance of municipalities in fulfilling their developmental mandate. If developed properly the performance management system can become a powerful tool for building a high performance municipality and bridging the gap between planning and implementation (Performance Management Regulations, 2001:5).

2. Legislative Framework on Local Government Performance Management

Performance management, as an instrument for good governance, must ensure that it reaches the local sphere's developmental objectives. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, Chapter 7 deals exclusively with the local sphere of government and lists the objects and developmental duties of municipalities. The Municipal Structures Act 1998 Section 19(1) states that a municipal council must strive within its capacity to achieve the objectives set out in Section 152 of the *Constitution*. In terms of section 19(2) of the Municipal Structures Act it is stipulated that a municipal council must annually review its overall performance in achieving the set objectives. The way that local government can manage and ensure that its developmental objectives have been met, is thus through the performance management system. Government, within this governance framework, gives us the tools to execute the above objectives and developmental duties. The Integrated development planning, budgeting and performance management are powerful tools which can assist municipalities to develop an integrated perspective on the development in their area. It will enable them to focus on priorities within an increasingly complex and diverse set of demands. It will enable them to direct resource allocation and institutional systems to a new set of development objectives (Treasury, 2008:14-15).

In other words, good corporate citizenship is all about how the municipalities set their priorities through the performance management system as per the IDP, conduct their business as per the SDBIP and relate to the community they serve through community input and public participation (The Institute for Performance Management, 2007). The behaviour is enshrined in the Batho Pele Principles (2008) to ensure better services are delivered towards the communities they serve. It is thus an integrated system that is best described in Chapter 6 of the Local Government Municipal Systems Act (2000) as amended which specifically emphasises that the municipality must implement a performance management system that is in line with the priorities, objectives, indicators and targets contained in the IDP. The Act furthermore states that the performance management system must be commensurate with its resources and promote a culture of performance management among its political structures, political office bearers and councillors, and in its administration, and administer its affairs in an economical, effective, efficient and accountable manner (Treasury, 2008:14-15).

Ultimately, sound governance can thus be referred to as an integrated performance management system that regularly conducts planning, measuring, budgeting, implementing, monitoring, assessing, reporting, evaluating and reviewing in a systematic way to ensure sustainable methods of meeting governance requirements, legislative compliance and community needs and demands. The platforms in a municipality used for these purposes are the IDP, performance management system, the SDBIP (departmental alignment) and the Individual Performance Plans of the Section 57 Managers. These then become the objectives and indicators of the Section 57 managers. The Section 57 managers, cascade the indicators and targets to the next level, sometimes referred to as the Lower SDBIP (Treasury, 2008:14-15).

3. The Relationship Between Performance Appraisal and Performance Management

According to Van der Westhuizen (2016:142) performance appraisal, sometimes called performance evaluation, performance measurement or performance review is the most common phase of the performance management process and one which most employees are familiar. Performance appraisal is defined as a part, phase, activities or aspect of

performance management through which the performance of an employee is appraised and a performance score or rating that indicates the level of performance is decided upon. Performance management in the public sector is a complex feature of the employment contract in which employers, employees and citizens share a reciprocal relationship and an exchange in which they have complementary rights, duties and responsibilities. Performance management is defined as a continuous, systematic and integrated process of identifying, appraising, managing and developing employee's performance. Performance appraisal may be defined as a formal and systematic process, by means of which the job-relevant strengths and weaknesses of employees are identified, observed, measured, recorded and developed (Swanepoel *et al.*, 2008:369).

According to Swanepoel (2008:371-372) performance appraisal is also the human resource function most often criticised and whose system carry the greatest risk of either failing, falling into disuse or degenerating towards a meaningless paperwork. Performance management can be regarded as non-time specific on-going process that involve the planning, managing, reviewing, rewarding and development of individual or group performance. The performance appraisals and performance management are intertwined in the successful delivery of public institutions goods and services to consumers. Performance appraisal is carried out as a phase of a performance cycle of a public institution. The performance cycle consists of multiple phases and performance management consists of multiple performance cycles. Without performance appraisal, the process of performance management is deficient. Depending on the policies that are adopted by public institutions a performance cycle may consist of two performances appraisal phases that are conducted at regular intervals, normally one in the middle and the other at the end of the performance cycle. Performance appraisal is therefore a small fraction of a comprehensive process of managing performance whereas performance management is holistic, integrated and systematic.

This difference is substantiated by the nature of outputs and outcomes that performance appraisal and performance management anticipate achieving. The objectives of performance management surpass those of performance appraisal in that the impact of performance management goes beyond the boundaries of public institutions. This means that if public institutions implements performance management

effectively it satisfies the needs of consumers that are not necessarily part of it whereas the outcomes of performance appraisal are consumed internally (Van der Westhuizen, 2016:143-144).

4. Purpose of Performance Appraisals

The purpose of performance appraisal is classified into three categories, namely, administrative, employee development and institutional development all of which are reflected in the definitions of performance appraisal and performance as well as the relationship and differences between them. The categories are outlined as follows;

4.1 Performance Appraisals as Administrative Instruments

Performance appraisals are important administrative instruments that help managers to make significant operational and human resource management decisions. Administratively, performance appraisals make available performance information that may be used to administer decisions about the following:

- **Career Management and Human Resources Planning:** Appraisers gain insight into employee's career goals, the type of support they need to reach their career goals and support that an employee may need to support other employees to develop their skills;
- **Financial Rewards:** Performance appraisals may be used as a determining factor in financial aspects such as annual salary increases, pay progression and performance bonuses;
- **Management of Discipline:** Identification of unsatisfactory performance and destructive behavior and appraisers are enabled to institute corrective action by means of coaching, counseling and referrals to employee assistance services;
- **Employee Placement Decisions:** Appraisers gain knowledge about the discipline employees are qualified or interested;
- **Workforce Research:** The information that is gained through performance appraisals may be used to examine or compare employees team or team performance over multiple periods (van der Westhuizen, 2016:144-145).

4.2 Employee Development

Performance appraisals help employees develop their chosen careers. As a development instrument they facilitate activities through which employees are able to achieve personal development. Performance appraisals may reduce the occurrence of rating errors by appraisers and allow for procedural fairness in public institutions. They empower employees by giving them an input into decisions about their personal development.

4.3 Institutional Development

The purpose of performance appraisals in enhancing institutional development cannot be explained in isolation from their administrative purpose and employee development. These three purposes are interlinked in that administrative decisions are essentially about employee development. If employees are able to predict their career development and are rewarded on merit and placed in appropriate positions, they tend to be productive, committed, motivated to perform even better and in general are satisfied with their work. In this way employee performance improves that of a public institution. A public institution is then able to satisfy the needs of its customers (citizens) and improve on its image. Because performance appraisals improve communication between appraisers and employees, they enhance co-operation and create a common vision amongst employees, which is necessary to achieve the goals of the institution (van der Westhuizen, 2016:146)

5. Developing a Performance Management System

According to Swanepoel (2008:379) it is very important to develop a performance management system which is not an isolated project, but well aligned to other Human Resources Management systems. Typical issues to be addressed to ensure an appropriate customised performance management system are highlighted in the subsections that follow:

5.1 Pre-Design Considerations

An effective performance management system should enable and empower line management to implement the strategies and objectives of an organization successfully. Probably one of the

most crucial aspects during the very early stages of planning the introduction of systematic performance management would be the very question of whether we want to have such a formal system for managing work performance or not. While Human Resources practitioners might well see the value and have relevant expertise the key is that top management team must be keen to have it. If it can be demonstrated that such a system is fundamental to the actual process of strategy execution it should be pretty straightforward.

5.2 Designing the System

Once the decision has been made active engagement in developing the system will commence. The input of the internal or external specialists is required. Probably the most important thing is to engage the people who will be using the system. The actual essential activities must be performed to actually develop the system:

- **Obtaining Basic Job Information:** Job design and analysis, which form the cornerstone of gathering job related information. The nature of the work and typical job duties and responsibilities, should guide how the system should work.
- **Establishing Performance Standards and Performance Criteria:** Performance standards describe the conditions for desired work performance. The system should probably be designed such that the work performance standards are mutually agreed upon by those who must do the work and those to whom they report.
- **Choosing the Format and the Source of Appraisal Information:** Decisions on the format of appraisal instrument and sources that should generate the ratings must again be the outcome of thorough deliberation on my factors such as the overall objectives, potential advantages and disadvantages and organisation-specific circumstances.
- **Preparing Documentation:** The relevant policy documents should form the framework for the process and procedures that detail more finely who should be doing what and when in terms of the planning and managing work performance. The actual performance appraisals forms are very important because they will form the basis for discussions as well as where we will be able to

access relevant work performance related information. It is normally quite important to develop user guides together with the policies and procedures manuals for managers. Particularly important in this regard will be guidelines in relation to the actual processes of assessing and discussing matters related to work performance.

5.3 Introducing and Operationalising the System

Process related to the implementation phase focus mainly on various training sessions and introductory exercises. The contents of such training may be determined by the level of involvement of users during and the development phase, the complexity of the specific system and existing competence in performance management of the supervisors.

5.4 Maintaining the System

The maintenance of an appraisal system entails activities such as:

- Monitoring the consistent application of performance ratings;
- Reviewing satisfaction levels of managerial as well as non- managerial staff who are using the system and finding out about what can be done to improve the system;
- Devising and arranging and arranging training and development interventions indicated by review results;
- Monitoring the internal and external environment for changing circumstances that may necessitate a review or adjustment of current practices; and auditing and evaluating the effectiveness of system comprehensively from time to time.

6. Synergy Between Organisational Performance Management and Individual Performance Management

The performance of a municipality is integrally linked to that of staff. It is therefore important to link organizational performance to individual performance and to manage both at the same time, but separately. The legislative mandate for measuring individual performance is found in Section 57 of the Municipal Systems Act, which requires that the Municipal

Manager and Managers who report directly to the Municipal Manager, sign performance contracts, which must include performance objectives and targets. These must be practical, measurable and based on key performance indicators set out on the IDP. Effectively, the organisational scorecard is executed by the employees of the municipality. In practice this means that the strategic organisational scorecard becomes the responsibility of the municipal manager, and the Cluster scorecard is the responsibility of the Deputy City Manager of the Cluster. The head of department's individual performance plans will flow out of the Deputy City Manager's performance plan and the manager on the lower level will have a performance plan that flows out of the head of the department's performance plan. This process is then cascaded down throughout the hierarchy of each of the department in the municipality. Although legislation requires that the municipal manager, and managers directly accountable to the municipal manager, sign formal performance contracts, it is also a requirement that all employees have job descriptions. These must be aligned with the individual performance plan of the head of the department. In this way all employees are working towards a common goal. It is however the responsibility of the employer, to create an environment, which the employees can deliver the objectives and the targets set for them in their performance contracts and job descriptions (Performance Management System Framework, 2008:16).

6.1 Benefits of a Performance Management System

6.1.1 Organisational Performance

The Organisational Performance Management System is advantageous to a municipality as it identifies major or systematic blockages and guides future planning and developmental objectives and resource utilization in the municipality. It provides a mechanism for managing expectations and ensuring increased accountability between residents of a municipal area and the political and administrative components of the municipality. It provides early warning signals to identify problems in meeting the IDP strategies. Provides appropriate management information for informed decision making.

6.1.2 Benefits of Individual Performance

Individual performance benefits ensure alignment of individual goals and objectives with that of the organisation and to coordinate efforts in order to

achieve those goals. The benefits ensure that there is an understanding of what is expected from the incumbents, by when it is expected and to what standard is expected. There is a clear understanding of the incumbent's key areas of accountability. Individual performance benefits are significant in determining whether or not performance objectives are being met or not. Qualified decisions within the incumbent's level of competencies are made and learning and development opportunities are created to enable the incumbents to meet the set standards of performance (Performance Management System Framework, 2008:18).

7. Individual Performance Management in Terms of Section 57 Managers

When designing the organisational structure of municipalities, Craythorne (2006:191-192) proposes it be done in stages. The first stage, called the macro-design stage would be to identify the sections, divisions, branches and departments. Next, top management for the organisation should be established. The final stage is the design of various units such as sections, divisions, etc. often called the micro-design stage. Within the second stage of design, the Section 57 managers should be appointed. It is important to note that the municipal manager, as the highest executive power within a municipality, must have the relevant skills and expertise to perform the duties associated with their positions. The municipal manager of the democratic South Africa is a key figure in the successful management of the administration of a municipality. The Local Municipal Systems Act (2000) spells out the functions and responsibilities of the municipal manager.

In short, the municipal manager is responsible for the formation and development of an economical, effective, efficient and accountable administration, the management of the municipality's administration in accordance with the Municipal Systems Act (2000) and other legislation related to municipalities, the implementation of a municipality's IDP, the management of the provision of services to the local community in a sustainable and equitable manner, the appointment of staff and maintenance of discipline of all staff and the promotion of sound labour relations, improvement of communication between municipality's administration and political structures and political office-bearers. The Local Government Municipal Systems Act, 2000 differentiate between

staff generally and managers directly accountable to the municipal manager or second-level posts. Persons filling those second-level positions are to be appointed by the council or executive committee of a municipality after consultation with the municipal manager. A municipal manager and senior managers directly accountable to the municipal manager may only be appointed to Section 57 managerial positions in terms of a written contract which complies with the provisions of section 57 of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000; and subject to a separate performance agreement to be concluded annually, and which must be concluded within a reasonable time after the appointment has been made and thereafter within one month of the beginning of each financial year.

Once the municipality has determined the role profiles for each Section 57 manager, the performance objectives and targets for each managerial position must be determined in respect of relevant key performance indicators set by the municipality in terms of Section 41(1)(a) of the Local Government Municipal Systems Act (2000). The role profile and the performance objectives and targets envisaged in the KPAs and respective KPAs must form the basis of any performance agreement linked to contracts of Section 57 managers. In terms of the guidelines of the Municipal Systems Act 2000 the Local Government: Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers Directly Accountable to Municipal Managers (2006) sets out the parameters on how the performance of Section 57 managers will be directed, monitored and improved. The performance plan may change annually based on changes made in the SDBIP. Parties must review the provisions of the agreement during June of each year and must compile a new performance agreement that replaces the previous agreement at least once a year within one month after the commencement of the new financial year. The agreement will terminate on the termination of the Section 57 manager's contract of employment for any reason. If at any time during the validity of the agreement, the work environment alters to the extent that the contents of the agreement are no longer appropriate, the contents must be mutually agreed between the parties and immediately revised. It is however important to note that 80% of the performance covered in the contract must relate to the SDBIP of a municipality.

The performance objectives and targets must be met by the employee within the set time-frame for

achieving targets. The key objectives describe the main tasks to be done. In collaboration with these objectives, the KPIs should provide details of the evidence that must be provided to show that a key objective has been achieved. A Section 57 manager's performance will, in addition to these objectives, also be measured in terms of the contribution she/he made to achieve the goals and strategies of the IDP or SDBIP of a municipality.

The criteria upon which the performance of a Section 57 manager must be assessed consist of two components, both of which must be contained in a performance agreement. The Section 57 manager must be assessed against both components with a weighting of 80:20, allocated to the Key Performance Areas (KPAs) and the Core Competency Requirements (CCRs) respectively. Each area of assessment is to be weighted and should contribute to a specific part of the total score. The assessment will be based on his/her performance in terms of outputs or outcomes identified as per the performance plan linked to the KPAs, linked to the organisational achievements.

8. Institutional Performance Management System

The publication of reports by the Auditor-General on financial statements and the performance of municipalities show that municipalities in South Africa are still struggling to perform efficiently and effectively. The root cause of this is the lack of internal controls and of governance principles, and the mismanagement in municipalities (Local Government Turnaround Strategy, 2009:11). The council's performance management system contains the following core elements:

Performance Planning ensures that the strategic direction of the Municipality more explicitly informs and aligns the IDP with all planning activities and resource decisions. This is the stage where Key Performance Areas and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are aligned to the IDP and national requirements, and targets are set.

Performance Measuring and Monitoring is an ongoing process to determine whether performance targets have been met, exceeded or not met. Projections can also be made during the year as to whether the final target and future targets will be met. It occurs during key points in a process for example, on a quarterly and annual basis.

Performance evaluation analyses why there is under-performance or what the factors were, that allowed good performance in a particular area. Where targets have not been met, the reasons for this must be examined and corrective action recommended. Evidence to support the status is also reviewed at this stage. An additional component is the review of the indicators to determine if they are feasible and are measuring the key areas appropriately. A corporate analysis of performance will be undertaken by the Performance Management Unit, to examine performance across the municipality in terms of all its priorities.

Performance Reporting entails reporting twice a year to management, the performance audit committee, council and the public. In addition, a quarterly report is also prepared and sent to Internal Audit to be audited, prior it being sent to council and the performance audit committee (Performance Management System Framework, 2008:20)

8.1 Institutional Key Performance Areas (KPAs)

The KPA's that must be adopted and contained by municipalities in their Local Government Strategic Agenda as the core KPA's in their organisational performance scorecard are outlined below as follows:

8.1.1 Basic Service Delivery

This includes aspects such as basic water, sanitation, electricity, refuse and roads. It also includes social infrastructure such as housing, health, education, welfare and cemeteries.

8.1.2 Local Economic Development

This include economic development and poverty alleviation strategies and awareness programmes, in addition to the social infrastructure, social programmes also form part of this e.g. HIV/AIDS, ABET which comprises of economic generation objectives and elements of poverty alleviation are also grouped in this area.

8.1.3 Governance and Public Participation

It measures how the local government sphere aligns and integrates with the provincial and national spheres of government on cross cutting issues, programmes to demonstrate how the community participates/ is consulted/ is empowered in government programmes; particularly the establishment and functionality of ward committees and community development workers and the involvement of Traditional Councils in municipal affairs.

8.1.4 Municipal Transformation and Organisational Development

The following questions must be asked to ensure municipal transformation.

- How the institution is (administratively and politically) capacitated to exercise its duties (Human Resource development and management)?
- How the organization is structured to meet the needs of the IDP?
- Is the organization accountable to the public via the necessary performance management systems?
- Are the internal policies and processes adhering to aspects like gender equity, disability and general management of the municipality?

8.1.5 Municipal Financial Viability and Management

It comprises the policies and process relating to revenue generation, debt and credit management as well assets and liability control and auditing, and aspects such as submission of the financial statements to the Auditor General (AG) as well as the findings of the AG on the Municipal Affairs Compliance with Municipal Finance Management Act and the Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (Performance management system framework, 2008:22).

8.2 Institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)

Key Performance Indicators are measurements that indicate whether progress is being made in achieving the SFA's. Indicators are important as they provide a common framework for gathering data for measurements and reporting: translate complex concepts into simple operational measurable variables, enable the review of goals and objectives, help provide feedback to the municipality and staff, and identify the gaps between IDP strategies and the operational plans of the various departments and setting of Key Performance Indicators. The key performance indicators should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-framed (SMART). Key Performance Information concepts should also be considered when indicators are set such as:

- Input Indicators: all the resources that contribute to the production and delivery of outputs. Inputs are "what we use to do the work".

- They include finances, personnel, equipment and buildings.
- Activity indicators: the processes or actions that use a range of inputs to produce the desired outputs and ultimately outcomes. In essence, activities describe "what we do".
- Output indicators: the final products, or goods and services produced for delivery. Outputs may be defined as "what we produce or deliver".

Outcome indicators: the medium-term results for specific beneficiaries that are the consequence of achieving specific outputs. Outcomes should relate clearly to institution's strategic goals and objectives set out in its plans. Outcomes are "what we wish to achieve".

Impact indicators: the results of achieving specific outcomes, such as reducing poverty and creating jobs (Performance management system framework, 2008:24).

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

The paper explained the legislative framework of performance management system in local government. It also examined the development and the relationship between performance management and performance appraisals. The individual and institutional performance management system was discussed in detail. It is evident that the South African Local Government performance management system is developed and derived from the local government legislative framework can be concluded that strengthening the performance management system could be the basis of effective service delivery in municipalities. According to the 2016/2017 financial year the Auditor-General's report indicated that out of the eight Metropolitan Council municipalities it is only the three Metropolitan Councils that had a clean audit. The Auditor-General's report confirms that there is sufficient budget to render services but the implementation process seem to be biggest hurdle pertaining to service delivery. The local government enacted regulations dealing specifically with issues related to individual performance management and institutional performance management in municipalities, instead serious challenges are posed in implementing a municipal performance management system to promote the culture of good performance in municipalities.

The primary and key recommendation is the crafting or formulation of the Local Government Performance Management system implementation strategy. Strategy positioning and implementation must be adopted by all the municipalities. There is a need for the South African Local Government officials to benchmark on the best practices and policies practiced by Metropolitans such as New York City in the US and London in the United Kingdom. All the municipalities have the Performance Management policies and frameworks but they are unable to implement them according to their set standards of performance and stipulated timelines. It is therefore, recommended that local government must conduct a management skills audit. This will highlight gaps in competence and may identify training needs for managers to meet new performance demands. This is important to ensure the success of the Performance management system. It is suggested that success will depend quite significantly on skilled and competent municipal managers who are leaders and who possess broad yet finely-honed skills.

The scorecard approach is a dynamic tool which is easy to change and can be presented differently for baseline workers depending on one's specific circumstance. However, they should also be viewed with caution because for other people or employees they could contain a lot of confusion and complexity. Moreover, the scorecard system is the integral component of the Performance management system, it consists of the district scorecard and the department scorecard. The district scorecards are broader issues, some of which the institution has no influence over but would like to measure. The departmental scorecard is more specific and allows for departments to be measured on issues that they would like to be measured on.

Lastly there is a need to implement change management. The employees must be informed of the need for change. The internal or external change agents must be identified to facilitate the change process. An environment and climate that support the change process must be fostered and the objectives of the organization must be adapted. It also became evident that change primarily involves people. Therefore, it is important for change agents to involve the people in the organization in the process of change.

References

- Craythorne, D.L. 2006. *Municipal Administration: The Handbook*. Cape Town: Juta.
- South Africa. 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act of 1996* Pretoria. Government Printers.
- South Africa. 2000. *Local Government Municipal Systems Act, No. 32 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. 2000. *Local Government Structures Act, No. 117*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. 2003. *Local Government Municipal Finance Management Act, No. 56 of 2003*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. 2007. Department of National Treasury. 2007. *Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information*.
- South Africa. 2008. eThekweni Municipality. *Organizational Performance Framework*. Durban: eThekweni Municipality.
- South Africa. Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2001. *Local Government Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations*. 2001. Pretoria. Government Printers.
- South Africa. Department of Provincial and Local Government, 2006. *Local Government Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers Directly Accountable to Municipal Manager*. Pretoria. Government Printers.
- South Africa. Department of National Treasury. 2007. *Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information*. Pretoria. Government Printers.
- Swanepoel, B.J., Erasmus, B.J. & Schenk, H. 2008. *South African Human Resource Management*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Van Der Westhuizen, E. 2016. *Human Resources in Government: A South African perspective on theories, politics and process*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Venter, A. *et al.* 2007. *Municipal Management: Serving the People*. Cape Town: Juta.